

Senator's Senator." (One popular definition: "A man who, if he can't help you win, helps you look good losing.") Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, declares, "Maggie doesn't have an enemy on either side of the aisle." Adds liberal Democrat PHIL HART, of Michigan: "He's just one of the really nice guys in this place."

A psychiatrist might contend the 60-year-old Senator's desire for friendship reflects a childhood insecurity. Orphaned at the age of 3 weeks, he was adopted by a Swedish family in Minnesota. But at the age of 17, he worked his way West—riding freight trains and doing farm labor—until he reached Seattle. Seven years later, he had worked his way through the University of Washington and its law school and in 1933 won his first election, to the State legislature. Since then he has been in 23 more and won them all, although he received the scare of his life in 1962 when an unknown minister came within 45,000 votes of turning him out of his Senate seat.

Like many of those in the Senate, Senator MAGNUSON seems to find most of his pleasure in the company of his fellow club members. He plays poker with a congressional group almost every Thursday night, attends football and baseball games with Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia. A good companion, he is fond of telling funny stories about his fellow Scandinavians. Before his marriage, he was one of the Capital's gayer bachelors; now he spends most evenings reading and works at painting on the weekends. He is an unabashed sentimentalist, a quality that endears him to his frequently thick-skinned Senate mates.

But popularity on Capitol Hill is more than a matter of being pleasant, amusing nice guy. To get along, goes the proverb, go along. And Senator MAGNUSON tries hard to help his colleagues wherever possible. Some outside critics suggest he is a bit too accommodating and even something of a wheeler-dealer. But the most sternly moralistic among his fellow Senators deny there is anything sinister about his horse trading.

"Maggie wouldn't compromise with principle," one realistic Senate veteran says, "but he's not one of those fellows who looks for a moral issue in every little political proposal. He's not dogmatic or doctrinaire. He can give a little on most things. Some of these birds around here are everything in such categorical terms, they never have any room to maneuver."

Placing Senator MAGNUSON within the ideological spectrum is not easy. Both the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Americans for Democratic Action rate him, on his voting record, as a solid liberal. He wears that badge proudly, but adds that he is a conservative in fiscal matters. "I helped cut \$6 billion off the Federal budget in the last 10 years," he declares. Some of his friends describe him as an instinctive conservative whose natural bent is tempered by political realism and a soft heart.

Even when he is shepherding an administration proposal or one of his own through his committee, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON is always seeking the sort of consensus so dear to his friend in the White House. And if he finds it impossible to get, he's quite content to let the matter rest until a better day. "We seldom pass a bill in the Commerce Committee that isn't pretty well agreed on," he remarks.

NO ARMTWISTER

Nor is such agreement the grudging result of any arm-twisting on his part. The chairman of a Senate committee enjoys broad power, and more than one has been known to use it tyrannically at times. But not the senior Senator from Washington. His permissiveness makes the public hearings of the Commerce Committee the most relaxed in town. It encourages many members to indulge their penchant for comedy, and occa-

sionally reduces the time schedule to a sham-ble. Once the doors are closed on executive sessions, committee members say, their chairman is brisker, but never domineering.

So adroitly has Senator MAGNUSON steered clear of controversy that he has really only been embroiled in a couple of bitter, knock-down battles. One was the dispute over construction of a multipurpose dam in Idaho's Hells Canyon in 1956 and the other was the 1959 wrangle over Senate confirmation of Adm. Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. (Senator MAGNUSON suffered one of his infrequent defeats when the big dam was rejected in favor of two low-level dams, but he was on the winning side as Admiral Strauss was retired to private life.)

When he is forced into the line of fire, Senator MAGNUSON usually emerges magically unscathed. He pushed the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill and the communications satellite bill through his committee without alienating either the southerners, violently opposed to the first, or the liberals, adamantly against the second. Second-ranking committee Democrat, JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, on the other hand, was raked from both sides and lost the election for assistant majority leader partly as a result.

But his fellow Senators don't just like Senator MAGNUSON; they trust him. "Everybody knows 'Maggie's' not out to do anybody in," explains a colleague of years' standing. "He has no further political ambitions, so he's not trying to take anything away from somebody else. All he wants is to be liked." This attitude, plus his acceptability to L.B.J. and the Senate's elders, was responsible for Senator MAGNUSON's selection (over then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY) as head of the senatorial campaign committee.

As they trust his good faith, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON's colleagues also trust his instincts and judgment. "I doubt," asserts a strong liberal, "that 'Maggie' ever read the civil rights bill clear through. He doesn't have a mind that focuses on detail and niceties. But he came down hard on the right side." And if he is no deep thinker, he is also far from ill informed where his own legislative specialties are concerned.

RELiance ON STAFFS

He relies heavily on personal and committee staffs whose abilities are acknowledged by Democratic and Republican members alike. (So many persons work for Senator MAGNUSON directly or indirectly that one long corridor of the Senate Office Building is known as "Maggie's alley.") And unlike many in Congress, he does not spread himself thin. He specializes in his committee's concerns, with particular interest in fisheries, merchant marine, and the like which mean bread and butter to his home State.

It's a rare Senator, therefore, who can bring himself to turn Senator MAGNUSON down when he entreats support. "He'll go to a fellow like JOHN STENNIS, for example, and tell him how desperately the Pacific fishing industry needs help," says an admiring associate. "STENNIS won't give a damn one way or another, but 'Maggie' will be so earnest and so determined that he'll figure if 'Maggie' feels that strongly about it he must be right. Anyway, the demand is never outrageous and it never involves taking something away from somebody else. If 'Maggie' usually gets what he wants, it's because he usually wants what he can get."

Nonetheless, his modest goals have resulted in such legislative piums as a \$10 million Federal grant for the 1962 Seattle World's Fair; a chain of dams along the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and an amendment to the food-for-peace program adding fish to the surplus foods which can be sold to foreign countries under special, easy terms. (The only fish currently in surplus in the United States just happens to be pink salmon, most of which is caught and canned in the

Pacific Northwest.) And Washington, 23d State in population, collects one of every six Federal public works dollars.

Many of his contributions, his admirers say, go unnoticed because Senator MAGNUSON avoids attracting attention. In fact, his manner of operating may have been best described by President Kennedy when he spoke at a 1961 dinner honoring Senator MAGNUSON's 25th anniversary in Congress.

"Most Members of the Senate," President Kennedy said, "have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator MAGNUSON's meteoric career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public occasions, but in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk—he comes into the Senate late in the afternoon—he is very hesitant about interrupting other Members of the Senate—when he rises to speak, most Members of the Senate have left—he sends his messages up to the Senate and everyone says, 'What is it' and Senator MAGNUSON says, 'It's nothing important.' And Grand Coulee Dam is built."

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND FIREARMS CONTROL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in recent months there has been an increasing hue and cry in the land for stricter controls on the sale and possession of firearms. I do not think that anyone quarrels with the proposition that, in some sound and sensible manner, this Nation—or more properly the several States—must devise means of keeping lethal instruments, especially guns, out of the hands of criminals, incompetents and the mentally ill.

The question is not one of ends but of means. The second amendment to the Constitution of the United States, one of the clauses in our precious Bill of Rights, states, in full:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

In the minds and hearts of many patriotic and law-abiding citizens, this freedom guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, the freedom to possess a weapon for defense of home and State, is no less important, no less sacred than the freedoms of speech, press, religion, assembly and petition guaranteed by the first amendment. And, whatever one's personal ranking of the values of these several freedoms, no one can gainsay that they are alike guaranteed by our Constitution.

It is widely recognized that the freedoms of speech and press, though couched in absolute terms in the first amendment, are not in fact absolute. I think that few if any citizens disagree with Justice Holmes' famous dictum that the constitutional guarantee of free speech gives no one the right to raise a false cry of "Fire" in a crowded theater. Similarly, some limitations on the right to buy and keep arms will be approved by all sensible men. Reasonable limitations are supported, indeed, by the National Rifle Association of America, Inc., and by the thousands of sportsmen's and gun clubs throughout this broad land.

But, Mr. President, just as there are some citizens who would go beyond the

April 27, 1965

bounds of reason, necessity, and the Constitution in curbing freedom of speech, on the ground that the freedom is occasionally abused, so there are some citizens who would transgress reason, necessity, and the Constitution in the imposition of controls on the right to keep and bear arms.

Mr. President, I am concerned, deeply concerned, that some in this Nation and perhaps some of us in this body may be in danger, through overzealousness, of burning down the barn to get rid of the rats.

No one has given more sincere and prolonged study to the problems involved in firearms control than the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. In the last Congress, following long investigation and hearings by the subcommittee, the Senator sponsored a bill on firearms control that won the support of the National Rifle Association and of many sportsmen, gun dealers and gun collectors. That bill, S. 1975, 88th Congress, was the subject of hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee but was not acted upon. Senator Dodd reintroduced it as S. 14 in the early days of the present Congress; and I think it likely that it would have again won the support of the NRA and of millions of law-abiding citizens who cherish their right to sell, own and sensibly use small firearms.

However, for reasons not entirely clear to me, the administration advanced another and far more stringent bill, which the Senator has now introduced with the apparent intention that it supersede S. 14, his earlier bill.

I have received a veritable storm of protest against this new bill, S. 1592, from my constituents in Alabama. In response to their wishes, and in evidence of my own concern, I have written a letter to Senator Dodd on the subject. In my letter, I quoted in part a circular letter sent on April 9 by the National Rifle Association of America to its members. In pertinent part, the circular letter stated:

S. 1592, the latest bill, prohibits all mail-order sales to individuals and permits such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers. Thus it places harsh and unreasonable restrictions upon law-abiding citizens who wish to order sporting firearms (rifles and shotguns) by mail, especially those citizens who do not have convenient access to licensed dealers for over-the-counter sales.

This bill, if enacted, would give the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, unlimited power to surround all sales of guns by dealers with arbitrary and burdensome regulations and restrictions.

Anyone engaged in the manufacture of ammunition would be required to have a \$1,000 manufacturer's license. Apparently this would apply to a club engaged in reloading for its members. Anyone selling any rifle ammunition, even .22 caliber, would be compelled to have a \$100 dealer's license. This would eliminate the usual hardware and other small store sales.

If you transported your rifle or shotgun to another State for a lawful purpose, such as hunting, you would have to comply with such burdensome restrictions and red tape as might be required by the regulations.

A dealer could not sell to a nonresident of his State. This provision, and the restrictions on transporting guns from one State to another, could be unduly restrictive on a great many people who live near State boundaries or those who must go into another State to shop.

A gun shipped for service repairs could only be shipped under the regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury and then only for "authorized" service. Again, burdensome restrictions are threatened.

A dealer's license could be refused to an applicant if the Treasury believes that by reason of business experience, financial standing, or trade connections, he is not likely to operate in compliance with the act. What does this mean?

An importer could not bring in any new firearms unless the Secretary deems that such importation "would not be contrary to the public interest." What does this mean?

This bill conceivably could lead to administrative decisions imposing such a burden on the sale, possession and use of firearms for legitimate purposes as to totally discourage, and thus to eliminate, the private ownership of all guns.

I expressed to Senator Dodd my own concern about the bill and I urged him to hold exhaustive hearings on it. I am confident, Mr. President that if all contending points of view can be fully aired in this matter, reason will prevail.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 154, H.R. 7091.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I support the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1965, and I am especially interested in title II, which provides moneys for the financing of the Appalachian regional development program. I am not one who believes that poverty will ever be completely eliminated from our midst. Speeches often glibly refer to a future time when there will be a job for every individual in the United States and when no family will be poverty stricken. Although such a utopia would be wonderful if we could ever achieve it, I am afraid that such statements run counter to the admonition of Jesus, who said:

For ye have the poor always with you.

Regardless of how much effort and money the Federal Government puts into

so-called poverty programs, there will always be some poverty and some unemployment in every State. No amount of Federal largess will cure all of the country's problems. Nevertheless, the fact remains that people, generally, have a desire to help themselves, and because of circumstances beyond their immediate control, they and their communities are sometimes unable to find the resources needed to lift themselves into a viable economic state. These are the areas and these are the people for whom the Appalachian Regional Development Act is designed to render assistance.

The area of Appalachia covers 165,000 square miles. About 15 million people live in Appalachia. Hence, 8 percent of the population of America is in the Appalachian region. It is a region rich in mineral resources, a region originally blessed with great soil, forest, and water resources, and a region populated by a sturdy, patriotic, and loyal citizenry. Much of the mineral resources have been exploited by outside interests and, admittedly, some of the present misery, unemployment, and poverty, where it does exist, is there perhaps because of opportunities that have been passed by and the lack of proper vision and planning in an earlier day.

Parenthetically, in making reference to poverty, I wish to emphasize that all people in Appalachia do not live in hovels, and one does not come face to face with poverty at every bend of the road. Unfortunately, some outsiders, and certain national publications, have sought to create the impression that Appalachia is a land where people are shoeless, hungry, homeless, and living from hand to mouth. Of course, such exceptions occur, but they can be found in every State of the Union. Many areas of Appalachia are prosperous, and others not so prosperous are showing great economic improvement, and, I believe that, in general, the overall economy has shown a remarkable upward movement within the last 2 or 3 years.

This is not to gainsay the fact, however, that the region as a whole lags behind the Nation as a whole from the standpoint of having a viable and progressive and strong economy. If the per capita income of people living in the Appalachian region were to be brought up to the national average, the gross national product would be increased by several billion dollars annually. Retail sales would climb nationally. Food production would go up. Automobile sales would be stimulated. Higher Federal, State, and local tax receipts would result. And just as a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, the Nation is just as strong as its weakest region. Economic strength is one of the bases of our military strength, and the development of economic strength in Appalachia will redound to a stronger national military potential.

Importantly, it should not be overlooked that if the Appalachian region can be brought up to the national norm from the standpoint of its economy, savings obviously can be realized through a reduction, percentage-wise, of public assistance dollars which are being spent in